

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 042094
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 DODE-00 ISO-00 ACDA-12 INR-10 NSCE-00 PM-05
SP-02 SS-15 L-03 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 SSO-00 INRE-00
/060 R

DRAFTED BY OSD/ISA:TPHDUNLOP; ACDA/ISP/REG:RLFISCHER:KS
APPROVED BY EUR/RPM:WSHINN, JR.
ACDA/ISP/REG:MHUMPHREYS
EUR/RPM:JCKORNBLUM; PBSWIERS
INR/PMT:RHBARAZ (INFO)
NSC:GSTREVERTON (INFO)
PM/DCA:WCVEALE (INFO)
S/MS:JMJOYCE (INFO)
S/P:PSKAPLAN (;NFO)

-----057010 170248Z /66

O 170120Z FEB 78
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY BELGRADE IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE
USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY
ALL NATO CAPITALS

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 042094

BELGRADE FOR USDEL CSCE

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS - RECENT SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

REFS:

A) BELGRADE 412;
B) BELGRADE 465;
C) STATE 285004;
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 042094

D) BELGRADE 661;
E) BELGRADE 789;
F) BELGRADE 799;
G) BELGRADE 872;
H) BELGRADE 1173;
I) BELGRADE 1216;
J) STATE 40775;
K) BELGRADE 414;

1. THIS MESSAGE ADDRESSES THE CBMS ISSUES, AS RAISED AND

DISCUSSED IN REFTELS, RELATING TO COMPOSITE ROMANIAN/NNA PROPOSAL ON PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS (REFS A, B, AND C); TO CANADIAN DRAFT LANGUAGE ON MOVEMENTS (REF D); TO NNA "COMPROMISE TEXT" (REFS E, F, G, H), AND TO DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE PROPOSALS.

2. THESE OBSERVATIONS ALSO PERTAIN TO CBMS PORTION OF PROPOSED WESTERN DRAFT (REF I), ESPECIALLY ABSENCE OF PROPOSED ALLIED CAVEAT FOR PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS. DEPARTMENT UNDERSTANDS THAT THIS TEXT IS INTENDED AS COMPROMISE PRODUCT AND THAT US ACCEPTANCE OF SPECIFIC PARAGRAPHS FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS DRAFT DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE ARE NECESSARILY BOUND BY THESE POSITIONS IN THE FUTURE. HOWEVER, AS NOTED IN STATE 40775 THE CBMS AREA IS ESPECIALLY SENSITIVE AND WE WOULD PREFER TO HAVE THE CAVEAT REFERRING TO "TIMES OF TENSION AND APPREHENSION" RETAINED. WE WILL NOT, HOWEVER, CONDITION AGREEMENT TO TABLE THE TEXT ON INCLUSION OF THIS LANGUAGE.

A. COMPOSITE ROMANIAN/NNA PROPOSAL.

3. WHILE THE COMPOSITE ROMANIAN AND NNA TEXT ON PRIOR CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 042094

NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS FORWARDED IN REFTELS A AND B INCHEDED INTO THE CONCEPTUAL SPACE THAT SEPARATED THEIR ORIGINAL PROPOSALS FROM THE ALLIED INITIATIVE ON THIS SUBJECT, THE SPECIFIC PARAMETERS ESSENTIAL FOR ALLIED ACCEPTANCE WERE STILL LACKING. THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THE NNA TEXT (REF B) INCORPORATED THE ALLIES' PROVISION FOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS "INTO OR WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA AS DEFINED IN THE FINAL ACT." THIS AND THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, HOWEVER, TIED THE PROPOSED TEXT MORE DIRECTLY THAN THE ORIGINAL ALLIED PROPOSAL DID NOT ONLY TO THE EXISTING PROVISIONS IN THE FINAL ACT BUT ALSO TO SUCH ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS AS MIGHT BE ADOPTED IN BELGRADE. THE LINKAGE THUS IMPLIED BY THE COMPOSITE ROMANIAN/NNA TEXT MIGHT ULTIMATELY BE TAKEN TO MEAN THAT IF MAJOR MANEUVERS WERE EVER TO BE NOTIFIED AT LESS THAN THE CURRENT 25,000 TROOP LEVEL, MAJOR MOVEMENTS AT LESS THAN THAT THRESHOLD WOULD HAVE TO BE NOTIFIED AS WELL. THE WORD "ALSO" IN THE SECOND SENTENCE OF THIS PARAGRAPH TENDED TO CONFIRM THE POSSIBILITY.

4. MISSING FROM THE ROMANIAN/NNA COMPOSITE TEXT WERE PROPOSED ALLIED TIME AND DISTANCE PARAMETERS DESIGNED TO EXEMPT LEGITIMATE "NO-NOTICE" READINESS EXERCISES AND LOW-LEVEL TROOP REPLACEMENTS AS WELL AS THE CAVEAT FOR TIMES OF TENSION AND APPREHENSION (I.E., SHORTER NOTICE FOR MOVEMENTS ONLY "FOR REASONS ARISING FROM A

LACK OF CLEAR, TIMELY OR ADEQUATE UNDERSTANDING OF THE REASONS FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF OTHER STATES"). ANY LINKAGE BETWEEN MOVEMENT AND MANEUVER PROVISIONS AT

BELGRADE SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ALLIED FORMULATION OF EXCEPTIONS TO THE MINIMUM PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS AND THE LACK OF CONSENSUS WITHIN THE ALLIANCE ON THE POSSIBILITY OF PRENOTIFYING MOVEMENTS OF LESS THAN 25,000 TROOPS.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 042094

5. WITH REGARD TO FINAL PARAGRAPH IN ROMANIAN/NNA COMPOSITE TEXT, REQUIRING THAT "FURTHER CONSIDERATION" BE GIVEN TO THE QUESTION OF "SMALLER SCALE OR NAVAL MOVEMENTS NEAR THE TERRITORY OF OTHER PARTICIPATING STATES," OUR COMMENTS ON THE ORIGINAL NNA CBMS PROPOSAL (REF C) REMAIN PERTINENT TO THIS FORMULATION. IN PARTICULAR, WE DO NOT CONCUR IN LANGUAGE COMMITTING PARTICIPANTS TO "GIVE FURTHER CONSIDERATION" TO THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF NAVAL MANEUVERS." AS POINTED OUT IN PARA 3, REF C, WE SEE NO MERIT IN LETTING THIS ISSUE DRAG OUT.

B. CANADIAN DRAFT.

6. WE HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH CANADIAN LANGUAGE ON MOVEMENTS (REFTEL D). HOWEVER, ALLIES SHOULD UNDERSTAND THAT WE HAVE NEVER INTENDED THAT CBMS CAPTURE AUTUMN FORGE SERIES OF NATO MANEUVERS AS A WHOLE. THEREFORE, WE ASSUME ALLIES CONCUR, AND THAT DISCUSSION/NEGOTIATING HISTORY IN BELGRADE WILL REFLECT, THAT PHRASE "COORDINATING PURPOSE", AS WELL AS CALL FOR NOTIFICATION "EVEN IF MOVEMENT TAKES PLACE IN PARTS, DIVIDED IN TIME AND/OR SPACE," IS NOT TO BE INTERPRETED AS REQUIRING NOTIFICATION OF ALL MOVEMENTS, OF WHATEVER SIZE, ASSOCIATED WITH AUTUMN FORGE. SPECIFICALLY, ALLIES WOULD NOTIFY MOVEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH COMPONENTS OF AUTUMN FORGE THAT FALL WITHIN PARAMETERS REQUIRING NOTIFICATION BUT WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO NOTIFY MOVEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH AUTUMN FORGE THAT ARE NOT OTHERWISE NOTIFIABLE. ADDITIONALLY, WE FAVOR A NARROW RATHER THAN BROAD DEFINITION OF COORDINATED PURPOSE INCLUDED IN THE NEGOTIATING RECORD, WITH EXAMPLES PROVIDED, SOME SUGGESTED TYPES OF MOVEMENT FOR "COORDINATED PURPOSES" WHILE NOT ALL INCLUSIVE ARE: STRATEGIC MOBILITY
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 042094

EXERCISES; ROUTINE MOVEMENT OF GROUND TROOPS TO A DESIGNATED MAJOR TRAINING AREA (MTA); AND INDIVIDUAL ROTATION OF REPLACEMENT PERSONNEL.

C. NNA COMPROMISE TEXT.

7. WE CONCUR WITH OBSERVATION IN DELEGATION'S PRELIMINARY AND SUBSEQUENT ASSESSMENTS OF CBMS PORTION OF NNA COMPROMISE TEXT (REFTEL E, PARA 2, SECTION 2)

THAT WE COULD NOT ACCEPT PROVISION FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFICATION OF NAVAL MOVEMENTS AND MANEUVERS, FOR NOTIFICATION OF AGGREGATED SMALLER-SCALE MANEUVERS, OR FOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS WITHOUT A MINIMUM 200 KILOMETER DISTANCE THRESHOLD (REFTELS F, PARA 4.B; G; H, PARA 3).

8. IN ADDITION TO ABSENCE OF ESSENTIAL 200 KM THRESHOLD FOR MOVEMENT NOTIFICATION IN CBMS PORTION OF NNA TEXT, ABSENCE OF THIRTY-DAY LIMIT ON REQUIREMENT TO NOTIFY NON-UNIT TROOP MOVEMENTS IS ALSO UNACCEPTABLE. THIRTY-DAY PROVISION WAS DESIGNED NOT ONLY TO CAPTURE SOVIET SEMI-ANNUAL ROTATIONS, AS DELEGATION NOTES IN REFTEL G, PARA 2B, BUT TO PROTECT US AND ALLIED OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY IN MOVING INDIVIDUAL TROOP REPLACEMENTS EITHER INTO OR WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA WITHOUT HAVING TO REPORT THEM. CONCEIVABLY, WITHOUT SPECIFYING SUCH A TIME LIMIT ON THE OBLIGATION TO REPORT DISAGGREGATED TROOP MOVEMENTS, THE US (AND PRESUMABLY OTHER ALLIES) WOULD HAVE TO PRENOTIFY ITS NON-UNIT TROOP ROTATIONS BOTH INTO AND WITHIN THE AREA 21 DAYS IN ADVANCE OF ANY DAY ON WHICH THE CUMULATIVE TOTAL OF THESE REPLACEMENTS WAS EXPECTED TO EXCEED 25,000. FOR THE US, THIS MIGHT MEAN, AT BEST, PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF ITS INDIVIDUAL MONTHLY REPLACEMENTS IN EUROPE APPROXIMATELY EVERY THIRD MONTH; AT
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 042094

WORST, MORE FREQUENT NOTIFICATIONS AS WELL AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE NIGHTMARE, IF UNIT AS WELL AS NON-UNIT MOVEMENT WITHIN THE AREA FOR A "COORDINATED PURPOSE, EVEN IF THE MOVEMENT TAKES PLACE IN PARTS, DIVIDED IN TIME AND/OR SPACE", IS NOT DEFINED BY SOME SUCH TIME-SPECIFIC STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS, (INSTEAD OF A THIRTY-DAY REQUIREMENT, FOR EXAMPLE "WITHIN A CALENDAR MONTH" WOULD BE AN ACCEPTABLE SUBSTITUTE IF THE FORMER SEEMS TO BE TOO COMPLEX OR CUMBERSOME A CONCEPT TO NEGOTIATE.)

9. FURTHERMORE, NOTWITHSTANDING DELEGATION VIEW REPORTED IN REF G, PARA 2, ABSENCE IN NNA COMPOSITE TEXT OF NARROWER ESCAPE CLAUSE CONTAINED IN ALLIED MOVEMENTS PROPOSALS PERMITTING "SHORTER NOTIFICATION" IS STILL CONSIDERED ESSENTIAL. NNA TEXT'S INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE OF ESCAPE CLAUSE CONTAINED IN CMB ON NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MANEUVERS, WHICH PROVIDES FOR NOTIFICATION "PRIOR" TO STARTING DATE, WOULD BE

UNACCEPTABLE IF APPLIED TO MOVEMENTS AS WELL AS
MANEUVERS. FYI. WE WOULD WISH TO PROTECT THEORETICAL

POSSIBILITY OF POST-FACTO NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 042094

IMPLIED BY "SHORTER NOTIFICATION" PROVISION IN
ORIGINAL ALLIED FORMULATION OF CAVEAT. END FYI.

10. INFORMATION ON "DIRECTION" AS WELL AS "DESTINATION"
OF MOVEMENT CALLED FOR IN NNA TEXT IS UNCLEAR. WHAT
SORT OF DIRECTION, APART FROM A DESTINATION, DO THE
SPONSORS HAVE IN MIND? THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT
IN DRAFT TEXT-THAT TERM MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENT IS
"ALSO APPLICABLE" WHEN MOVEMENT TAKES PLACE, ETC., - TENDS
TO LINK THE NNA MOVEMENT FORMULATION MORE DIRECTLY THAN
THE ALLIED PROPOSAL WOULD TO EXISTING MAJOR MANEUVER
PROVISIONS IN FINAL ACT. SUCH LINKAGE MIGHT ULTIMATELY
BE TAKEN TO MEAN THAT IF MAJOR MANEUVERS WERE EVER TO
BE NOTIFIED AT LESS THAN THE CURRENT 25,000 TROOP LEVEL,
MAJOR MOVEMENTS AT LESS THAN THAT THRESHOLD WOULD HAVE
TO BE NOTIFIED AS WELL. AS INDICATED ABOVE IN PARA 3,
WE WOULD HAVE TO OPPOSE SUCH WHOLESAL LINKAGE AT
PRESENT AND WOULD NOT WISH TO FORECLOSE OUR OPTION TO
DO SO IN THE FUTURE BY ACCEPTING LANGUAGE WHICH MIGHT
DO JUST THAT.

11. IF IT BECOMES IN OUR BEST INTEREST TO
ACHIEVE QUICK AGREEMENT ON AN ALLIED OR OTHER DOCUMENT,
A MOVEMENTS CBM IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE LOWEST
PRIORITY OF THE ISSUES AT THE CONFERENCE AND CAN BE
ELIMINATED FROM CONSIDERATION DUE TO ITS COMPLEXITY.

12. UK FORMULATIONS ON WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE
(PARA 4, REFTTEL K) GO FURTHER THAN SIMPLY NOTING
THAT THE QUESTION OF HOLDING SUCH A CONFERENCE IS ON
THE SSOD AGENDA.

13. THE FIRST UK FORMULATION, IN OUR VIEW, GOES
TOO FAR IN CONCEDING THE SUBSTANTIVE DESIRABILITY OF
SUCH A CONFERENCE. THE SECOND FORMULATION COULD BE
READ AS IMPLYING THAT SSOD CONSIDERATION OF THE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 08 STATE 042094

QUESTION OF HOLDING A WDC IS NOT SUFFICIENT TO SETTLE
THE QUESTION.

14. WE APPRECIATE THE UK POINT THAT SINGLNG OUT A
SINGLE SSOD ITEM HAS DISADVANTAGES. HOWEVER, WE
CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THAT THIS IS THE BEST SOLUTION,

IF SOME REFERENCE TO THE WDC ISSUE IS TACTICALLY
NECESSARY.

VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 042094
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /013 R

66011

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:PBSWIERS

APPROVED BY PBSWIERS

-----087053 180552Z /20

O 172240Z FEB 78

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

INFO RUFHNA/USDEL MC IMMEDIATE

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 042094

FOL RPT STATE 042094 ACTION BELGRADE INFO USNATO MBFR VIENNA
ALL NATO CAPITALS O 170120Z FEB 78 QUOTE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 042094

BELGRADE FOR USDEL CSCE

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS - RECENT SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

REFS:

A) BELGRADE 412;

B) BELGRADE 465;

C) STATE 285004;

D) BELGRADE 661;

E) BELGRADE 789;

F) BELGRADE 799;

G) BELGRADE 872;

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 042094

H) BELGRADE 1173;

I) BELGRADE 1216;

J) STATE 40775;

K) BELGRADE 414;

1. THIS MESSAGE ADDRESSES THE CBMS ISSUES, AS RAISED AND DISCUSSED IN REFTELS, RELATING TO COMPOSITE ROMANIAN/NNA PROPOSAL ON PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS (REFS A, B, AND C); TO CANADIAN DRAFT LANGUAGE ON MOVEMENTS (REF D); TO NNA "COMPROMISE TEXT" (REFS E, F, G, H), AND TO DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE PROPOSALS.

2. THESE OBSERVATIONS ALSO PERTAIN TO CBMS PORTION OF PROPOSED WESTERN DRAFT (REF I), ESPECIALLY ABSENCE OF PROPOSED ALLIED CAVEAT FOR PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS. DEPARTMENT UNDERSTANDS THAT THIS TEXT IS INTENDED AS COMPROMISE PRODUCT AND THAT US ACCEPTANCE OF SPECIFIC PARAGRAPHS FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS DRAFT DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE ARE NECESSARILY BOUND BY THESE POSITIONS IN THE FUTURE. HOWEVER, AS NOTED IN STATE 40775 THE CBMS AREA IS ESPECIALLY SENSITIVE AND WE WOULD PREFER TO HAVE THE CAVEAT REFERRING TO "TIMES OF TENSION AND APPREHENSION" RETAINED. WE WILL NOT, HOWEVER, CONDITION AGREEMENT TO TABLE THE TEXT ON INCLUSION OF THIS LANGUAGE.

A. COMPOSITE ROMANIAN/NNA PROPOSAL.

3. WHILE THE COMPOSITE ROMANIAN AND NNA TEXT ON PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS FORWARDED IN REFTELS A AND B INCHED INTO THE CONCEPTUAL SPACE THAT SEPARATED THEIR ORIGINAL PROPOSALS FROM THE ALLIED INITIATIVE ON THIS SUBJECT, THE SPECIFIC PARAMETERS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 042094

ESSENTIAL FOR ALLIED ACCEPTANCE WERE STILL LACKING. THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THE NNA TEXT (REF B) INCORPORATED THE ALLIES' PROVISION FOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS "INTO OR WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA AS DEFINED IN THE FINAL ACT." THIS AND THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, HOWEVER, TIED THE PROPOSED TEXT MORE DIRECTLY THAN THE ORIGINAL ALLIED PROPOSAL DID NOT ONLY TO THE EXISTING PROVISIONS IN THE FINAL ACT BUT ALSO TO SUCH ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS AS MIGHT BE ADOPTED IN BELGRADE. THE LINKAGE THUS IMPLIED BY THE COMPOSITE ROMANIAN/NNA TEXT MIGHT ULTIMATELY BE TAKEN TO MEAN THAT IF MAJOR MANEUVERS WERE EVER TO BE NOTIFIED AT LESS THAN THE CURRENT 25,000 TROOP LEVEL, MAJOR MOVEMENTS AT LESS THAN THAT THRESHOLD WOULD HAVE TO BE NOTIFIED AS WELL. THE WORD "ALSO" IN THE SECOND SENTENCE OF THIS PARAGRAPH TENDED TO CONFIRM THE POSSIBILITY.

4. MISSING FROM THE ROMANIAN/NNA COMPOSITE TEXT WERE PROPOSED ALLIED TIME AND DISTANCE PARAMETERS DESIGNED TO EXEMPT LEGITIMATE "NO-NOTICE" READINESS EXERCISES AND LOW-LEVEL TROOP REPLACEMENTS AS WELL AS THE CAVEAT

FOR TIMES OF TENSION AND APPREHENSION (I.E., SHORTER NOTICE FOR MOVEMENTS ONLY "FOR REASONS ARISING FROM A LACK OF CLEAR, TIMELY OR ADEQUATE UNDERSTANDING OF THE REASONS FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF OTHER STATES"). ANY LINKAGE BETWEEN MOVEMENT AND MANEUVER PROVISIONS AT

BELGRADE SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ALLIED FORMULATION OF EXCEPTIONS TO THE MINIMUM PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS AND THE LACK OF CONSENSUS WITHIN THE ALLIANCE ON THE POSSIBILITY OF PRENOTIFYING MOVEMENTS OF LESS THAN 25,000 TROOPS.

5. WITH REGARD TO FINAL PARAGRAPH IN ROMANIAN/NNA COMPOSITE TEXT, REQUIRING THAT "FURTHER CONSIDERATION" BE GIVEN TO THE QUESTION OF "SMALLER SCALE OR NAVAL CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 042094

MOVEMENTS NEAR THE TERRITORY OF OTHER PARTICIPATING STATES," OUR COMMENTS ON THE ORIGINAL NNA CBMS PROPOSAL (REF C) REMAIN PERTINENT TO THIS FORMULATION. IN PARTICULAR, WE DO NOT CONCUR IN LANGUAGE COMMITTING PARTICIPANTS TO "GIVE FURTHER CONSIDERATION" TO THE PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF NAVAL MANEUVERS." AS POINTED OUT IN PARA 3, REF C, WE SEE NO MERIT IN LETTING THIS ISSUE DRAG OUT.

B. CANADIAN DRAFT.

6. WE HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH CANADIAN LANGUAGE ON MOVEMENTS (REFTEL D). HOWEVER, ALLIES SHOULD UNDERSTAND THAT WE HAVE NEVER INTENDED THAT CBMS CAPTURE AUTUMN FORGE SERIES OF NATO MANEUVERS AS A WHOLE. THEREFORE, WE ASSUME ALLIES CONCUR, AND THAT DISCUSSION/NEGOTIATING HISTORY IN BELGRADE WILL REFLECT, THAT PHRASE "COORDINATING PURPOSE", AS WELL AS CALL FOR NOTIFICATION "EVEN IF MOVEMENT TAKES PLACE IN PARTS, DIVIDED IN TIME AND/OR SPACE," IS NOT TO BE INTERPRETED AS REQUIRING NOTIFICATION OF ALL MOVEMENTS, OF WHATEVER SIZE, ASSOCIATED WITH AUTUMN FORGE. SPECIFICALLY, ALLIES WOULD NOTIFY MOVEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH COMPONENTS OF AUTUMN FORGE THAT FALL WITHIN PARAMETERS REQUIRING NOTIFICATION BUT WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO NOTIFY MOVEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH AUTUMN FORGE THAT ARE NOT OTHERWISE NOTIFIABLE. ADDITIONALLY, WE FAVOR A NARROW RATHER THAN BROAD DEFINITION OF COORDINATED PURPOSE INCLUDED IN THE NEGOTIATING RECORD, WITH EXAMPLES PROVIDED, SOME SUGGESTED TYPES OF MOVEMENT FOR "COORDINATED PURPOSES" WHILE NOT ALL INCLUSIVE ARE: STRATEGIC MOBILITY EXERCISES; ROUTINE MOVEMENT OF GROUND TROOPS TO A DESIGNATED MAJOR TRAINING AREA (MTA); AND INDIVIDUAL ROTATION OF REPLACEMENT PERSONNEL.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 042094

C. NNA COMPROMISE TEXT.

7. WE CONCUR WITH OBSERVATION IN DELEGATION'S PRELIMINARY AND SUBSEQUENT ASSESSMENTS OF CBMS PORTION OF NNA COMPROMISE TEXT (REFTEL E, PARA 2, SECTION 2)

THAT WE COULD NOT ACCEPT PROVISION FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF NOTIFICATION OF NAVAL MOVEMENTS AND MANEUVERS, FOR NOTIFICATION OF AGGREGATED SMALLER-SCALE MANEUVERS, OR FOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS WITHOUT A MINIMUM 200 KILOMETER DISTANCE THRESHOLD (REFTELS F, PARA 4.B; G; H, PARA 3).

8. IN ADDITION TO ABSENCE OF ESSENTIAL 200 KM THRESHOLD FOR MOVEMENT NOTIFICATION IN CBMS PORTION OF NNA TEXT, ABSENCE OF THIRTY-DAY LIMIT ON REQUIREMENT TO NOTIFY NON-UNIT TROOP MOVEMENTS IS ALSO UNACCEPTABLE. THIRTY-DAY PROVISION WAS DESIGNED NOT ONLY TO CAPTURE SOVIET SEMI-ANNUAL ROTATIONS, AS DELEGATION NOTES IN REFTEL G, PARA 2B, BUT TO PROTECT US AND ALLIED OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY IN MOVING INDIVIDUAL TROOP REPLACEMENTS EITHER INTO OR WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA WITHOUT HAVING TO REPORT THEM. CONCEIVABLY, WITHOUT SPECIFYING SUCH A TIME LIMIT ON THE OBLIGATION TO REPORT DISAGGREGATED TROOP MOVEMENTS, THE US (AND PRESUMABLY OTHER ALLIES) WOULD HAVE TO PRENOTIFY ITS NON-UNIT TROOP ROTATIONS BOTH INTO AND WITHIN THE AREA 21 DAYS IN ADVANCE OF ANY DAY ON WHICH THE CUMULATIVE TOTAL OF THESE REPLACEMENTS WAS EXPECTED TO EXCEED 25,000. FOR THE US, THIS MIGHT MEAN, AT BEST, PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF ITS INDIVIDUAL MONTHLY REPLACEMENTS IN EUROPE APPROXIMATELY EVERY THIRD MONTH; AT WORST, MORE FREQUENT NOTIFICATIONS AS WELL AS AN ADMINISTRATIVE NIGHTMARE, IF UNIT AS WELL AS NON-UNIT MOVEMENT WITHIN THE AREA FOR A "COORDINATED PURPOSE, EVEN IF THE MOVEMENT TAKES PLACE IN PARTS, DIVIDED
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 042094

IN TIME AND/OR SPACE", IS NOT DEFINED BY SOME SUCH TIME-SPECIFIC STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS, (INSTEAD OF A THIRTY-DAY REQUIREMENT, FOR EXAMPLE "WITHIN A CALENDAR MONTH" WOULD BE AN ACCEPTABLE SUBSTITUTE IF THE FORMER SEEMS TO BE TOO COMPLEX OR CUMBERSOME A CONCEPT TO NEGOTIATE.)

9. FURTHERMORE, NOTWITHSTANDING DELEGATION VIEW REPORTED IN REF G, PARA 2, ABSENCE IN NNA COMPOSITE TEXT OF NARROWER ESCAPE CLAUSE CONTAINED IN ALLIED MOVEMENTS PROPOSALS PERMITTING "SHORTER NOTIFICATION" IS STILL CONSIDERED ESSENTIAL. NNA TEXT'S INCORPORATION BY

REFERENCE OF ESCAPE CLAUSE CONTAINED IN CMB ON NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MANEUVERS, WHICH PROVIDES FOR NOTIFICATION "PRIOR" TO STARTING DATE, WOULD BE UNACCEPTABLE IF APPLIED TO MOVEMENTS AS WELL AS MANEUVERS. FYI. WE WOULD WISH TO PROTECT THEORETICAL POSSIBILITY OF POST-FACTO NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS IMPLIED BY "SHORTER NOTIFICATION" PROVISION IN ORIGINAL ALLIED FORMULATION OF CAVEAT. END FYI.

10. INFORMATION ON "DIRECTION" AS WELL AS "DESTINATION" OF MOVEMENT CALLED FOR IN NNA TEXT IS UNCLEAR. WHAT SORT OF DIRECTION, APART FROM A DESTINATION, DO THE SPONSORS HAVE IN MIND? THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT IN DRAFT TEXT-THAT TERM MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENT IS "ALSO APPLICABLE" WHEN MOVEMENT TAKES PLACE, ETC., - TENDS TO LINK THE NNA MOVEMENT FORMULATION MORE DIRECTLY THAN THE ALLIED PROPOSAL WOULD TO EXISTING MAJOR MANEUVER PROVISIONS IN FINAL ACT. SUCH LINKAGE MIGHT ULTIMATELY BE TAKEN TO MEAN THAT IF MAJOR MANEUVERS WERE EVER TO BE NOTIFIED AT LESS THAN THE CURRENT 25,000 TROOP LEVEL, MAJOR MOVEMENTS AT LESS THAN THAT THRESHOLD WOULD HAVE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 042094

TO BE NOTIFIED AS WELL. AS INDICATED ABOVE IN PARA 3, WE WOULD HAVE TO OPPOSE SUCH WHOLESAL LINKAGE AT PRESENT AND WOULD NOT WISH TO FORECLOSE OUR OPTION TO DO SO IN THE FUTURE BY ACCEPTING LANGUAGE WHICH MIGHT DO JUST THAT.

11. IF IT BECOMES IN OUR BEST INTEREST TO ACHIEVE QUICK AGREEMENT ON AN ALLIED OR OTHER DOCUMENT, A MOVEMENTS CBM IS CONSIDERED TO HAVE LOWEST PRIORITY OF THE ISSUES AT THE CONFERENCE AND CAN BE ELIMINATED FROM CONSIDERATION DUE TO ITS COMPLEXITY.

12. UK FORMULATIONS ON WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (PARA 4, REFTTEL K) GO FURTHER THAN SIMPLY NOTING THAT THE QUESTION OF HOLDING SUCH A CONFERENCE IS ON THE SSOD AGENDA.

13. THE FIRST UK FORMULATION, IN OUR VIEW, GOES TOO FAR IN CONCEDING THE SUBSTANTIVE DESIRABILITY OF SUCH A CONFERENCE. THE SECOND FORMULATION COULD BE READ AS IMPLYING THAT SSOD CONSIDERATION OF THE QUESTION OF HOLDING A WDC IS NOT SUFFICIENT TO SETTLE THE QUESTION.

14. WE APPRECIATE THE UK POINT THAT SINGLING OUT A SINGLE SSOD ITEM HAS DISADVANTAGES. HOWEVER, WE CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THAT THIS IS THE BEST SOLUTION, IF SOME REFERENCE TO THE WDC ISSUE IS TACTICALLY NECESSARY.

VANCE UNQUOTE VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 26 sep 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MEETING REPORTS, DEFENSIVE CAPABILITIES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 17 feb 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978STATE042094
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: OSD/ISA:TPHDUNLOP; ACDA/ISP/REG:RLFISCHER:KS
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: D780072-1047
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t197802120/baaafbw1.tel
Line Count: 546
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 529eb5cf-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 10
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) BELGRADE 412; B) BELGRADE 465; C) STATE 285004;
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 23 may 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 3475763
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE/CBMS - RECENT SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES
TAGS: MARR, CSCE, NATO
To: BELGRADE INFO USNATO MULTIPLE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/529eb5cf-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014